

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office is requiring restriction under 35 U.S.C. § 121 into two groups identified as Group I drawn to an article and Group II, drawn to methods of moistening an article.

The basis of the restriction is that the “subcombination has separate utility such as a wipe. “

Applicants respectfully traverse the Restriction Requirement on the grounds that adequate reasons and/or examples have not been provided to support a conclusion of patentable distinctness between the identified groups. In particular, both groups have utility as a wipe, noting that the method claim 22, which is part of Group I and uses the article of claim 1, also is contacted with water for use.

Further, Applicants respectfully traverse the Restriction Requirement on the grounds that the Office has not shown that a burden exist in searching all of the claims. Accordingly, and for the reasons presented above, Applicants submit that the Office has failed to meet the burden necessary in order to sustain the Restriction Requirement. Withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement is respectfully requested.

An action on the merits is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Richard L. Treanor
Registration No. 36,379

Customer Number
22850

Daniel J. Pereira, Ph.D.
Registration No. 45,518

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)